DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 833 JC 720 077

AUTHOR Birenbaum, William M.
TITLE Planning Qualitative Disruption--A Critique of the Inferior Unrest Our Campuses Promote.
PUB DATE Jul 71
NOTE 14p.; Speech presented to the Sixth Annual Conference for Community College Presidents held at Charlotte, North Carolina and sponsored by the Univ. of North Carolina, Charlotte, and the State Board of Education, July 25-28, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; College Faculty; *Educational Change; *Educational Discrimination; Educational Philosophy; *Junior Colleges; *Minority Groups; Tenure; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this speech is to review the causes of campus unrest and to make recommendations for revisions in American higher education institutions. In an age when knowledge is power, American higher education has not made knowledge as freely available or as usable as is necessary. Further, campus governance has permitted and supported great inequalities--untenured faculty have little or no say in policy decisions and curriculum revision and the self-interest of faculty has led to poorer quality education as demonstrated when the least experienced faculty teach the largest freshmen classes. The result is a gap between the teachers and the taught. Another factor contributing to the distrust of higher education by youth is the unreality of the campus; the students' experiences and knowledge--especially of minority and poverty students--are ignored by faculty. Campuses continue to be segregated from urban problems at a time when the idea of creating isolated campuses is no longer tenable. In a section titled "Planned Unequal Opportunities," the author criticizes community college vocational programs and suggests that educationally deprived students may need more liberal education courses if they are to have equal opportunities in this country. Eight specific recommendations for change are included. (LP)

ED 060833

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PLANNING QUALITATIVE DISRUPTION--

A CRITIQUE OF THE INFERIOR UNREST OUR CAMPUSES PROMOTE

Dr. William M. Birenbaum, President
Staten Island Community College
Staten Island, New York

JC 720 077

A Speech Presented To The Presidents of North Carolina
Community Junior Colleges, Sixth Annual Conference
July, 1971

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 19 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

I. Thinking and Acting

Unrest among our youth and especially on our campuses is a direct function of two unusual sources of tension which has developed in American society and in its universities.

A. In the management and direction of American life, in all of its main parts--in industry, government, religion, the local community, education--the distance has grown between what we say and what we do. The quality of conduct is the issue here, and because conduct presumes first the possession and then the exercise of power, the quality of political life is the ultimate issue.

The university is meant to be a community based upon a relationship between people and knowledge. But in the ways they are organized and directed, many of our universities have deteriorated as working or workable communities. Vietnam, as a principle source of one of the deepest tensions in the larger society, permeates everything. But Vietnam as either an abstraction or a symbol, is quickly translated on the campus into a large number of daily, operational human relationships illustrative of the critical gap between American preachments and practices.

Campus life, therefore, becomes a living critical commentary upon the quality of national life, especially upon the quality of national political life. Unless the unrest is understood this way, prescriptions for coming to grips with it may in fact aggravate the problem rather than contribute to the solution of it.

B. The university's special claim for a growing portion of the nation's treasure and in behalf of a unique kind of autonomy (freedom), is based upon its assertion that it, and it primarily, is specially organized to convey the knowledge of our civilization and to create new knowledge in behalf of the progress of our society.

Our nation is the most mature in its dependence upon the use of knowledge in sustaining industry, the military, and conduct of government, and almost everything else. Access to and possession of varying kinds of knowledge are now central to economic survival in the United States.

Our nation is also now among the most mature in the development of its aspirations for equality and freedom among its people. This fact links access to and the possession of knowledge to effective political participation in American life.

Successful conduct in almost every aspect of American life now specially

depends upon the citizen's access to and possession of varying kinds of knowledge. Knowledge is tied in an imperative new way to conduct. Because of this, when one now says that Knowledge is Power, he is saying something which has a unique operational significance.

Given the university's traditional claims and pretensions, the significance of knowledge casts academic operations into a different perspective. Academic operations will especially be looked at in a different light by those for whom this society has traditionally planned a non-participatory role--by middle-class white youth who arrive at young adulthood having virtually no understanding of what it means to be responsible for conduct pursuant to making decisions; by Black youth who have been raised to young adulthood in homes, on streets, in neighborhoods and communities which are and have been, in American terms, powerless environments.

Dangerous gaps have opened between

a. the present state of our knowledge in key fields,
b. what must be done to acquire and master that knowledge,
c. and the conditions required for mastery of the successful use of that knowledge,

and,

the medieval and archaic ways most of our academic institutions are structured and operate with regard to getting access to the knowledge, mastering and applying it.

Most of our academic institutions continue to maintain walls between themselves and the environments upon which their existence depends, between systems for the mastery of thought processes and arenas for the expression of thought pursuant to the processes. Most continue to deny the relationship educationally between thinking, and conduct pursuant to thought.

The persistence of these academic attitudes results inevitably in an escalation of the causes of campus unrest.

The attitudes lead us directly into volatile new hypocritical situations. For example, on some of the most prestigious campuses which have been disrupted, where the quality of the faculties and the programs offered in Political Science are the most distinguished nationally and even internationally, the most inept and even corrupt self-government among the students and the faculties has been exposed. While the students on such campuses have earned their A's in the superior

curricula devoted to the art of government, they have demonstrated an F ability for governing themselves on their campuses. While their faculties travel to Washington to give advice, they turn out to be ineffective as advice-givers or as participants in their own campus communities at the moments of governmental crisis there. For example, I believe that the majority of those teaching in the field of sociology, and especially urban sociology, in the metropolitan New York City region, have had only the most casual and mediocre experience with regard to the life-dynamics of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. Most of them, by the nature of the system which produced them as professionals, are white and detached from the realities they purport to teach. I find a surprising number of them who do not even have a visual impression of these communities: They've never been there. Yet, it is these teacher-authority figures who stand in front of the increasing number of Black and Puerto Rican students entering their classrooms---students who travel every day from Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant---to tell them how, academically, it is. One of my students, a graduate of the Harlem Prep Academy, told me after his first eight weeks on my campus that he had been taught at the Academy that college success would depend most upon learning how to listen. "I have been on your campus eight weeks," he said, "and above all else, I have listened. I have learned something you ought to know. Your faculty around here has never learned to listen."

Who is the teacher and who is the taught? The clear answers we have brought to this question are no longer clear. Will the real campus please stand up? What stands up now is often shockingly surprising to those in charge. At Berkeley and Columbia, at City College and Harvard, the most disturbing initial action was at the gates in the walls. Naturally.

Once the action shifts, if it ever meaningfully does, to the campus legislative and conference rooms, where the redistribution of decision-making power is negotiated, where the new content of the curricula is decided, where a somewhat different view of the humans involved is defined, where the meaning of the "campus" is reconsidered, the main issue will be: Who shall possess the key to the gate, and on what terms; and what shall be the future of the walls, of the architecture and the plan of the future learning community?

II. LAW AND ORDER: DUE PROCESS

Law embodies a practical version of what the community to which it pertains accepts as being just. Due process refers to the ways that the community's version of justice may be administered. A community's "order" at any particular time will reflect the popular understanding of what is just, a

popular sense of jurisprudence. An orderly community is one in which either the people think their laws are just, or the people are kept powerless through successful tyranny. A disorderly community is one in which there is a breakdown between the meaning of the law and the popular understanding and/or acceptance of that.

Education, in essence, if it succeeds, is a disruptive process. It is not simply a case of training people to play basketball well according to the NCAA rules as administered by NCAA approved referees. Education, when it succeeds, raises fundamental questions about the validity of the NCAA conception of the game, about how referees are authorized, and about how they should perform. By its nature, education raises these questions even while the game is being played. Education may even raise the question of whether the coaches, who have a vested interest in the way the game is played, should dominate the NCAA legislative processes.

On the campuses the trouble with the academic law has been in two parts:

a. its obsession with the projection and defense of ancient elitist versions of academic justice, and

b. its failure to delineate and embody processes, now overdue, for change.

Academic law has gotten terribly out-of-tune with popular notions of what is just. These notions are being reshaped in the larger society mainly as a result of the powerful new connections between economic survival and political participation, and fair access to and effective possession of knowledge. Academic freedom, a concept which traditionally assumed that freedom-conditions in the larger society were qualitatively inferior to those required inside the academic walls, must be re-examined now under conditions where the freedom enjoyed in significant areas of American life is qualitatively superior to that prevailing inside the campus walls. This situation can lead to serious misunderstandings on the part of lay, political authorities when they think about law, order, and due process with regard to the academic scene. The layman may be thinking---as he legislates, makes political speeches, or administers the laws of the land---of the traditional American notions of law and order and due process; but on the campuses law, order and due process often follow lines sharply departing from the American traditions.

A. Faculty democracy is usually described as the keystone for the administration of academic freedom on the campus. But faculty democracy, where it exists at all on our campuses, involves something less than a third of those who teach our students on a full-time basis. The right to vote on the salient curricular, personnel, and budgetary matters is usually reserved for those who possess tenure. This means that the residency requirement for the franchise in our faculty "democracies" is anywhere from five to ten times longer than we require

for those who may vote for the President of the nation. The young faculty are generally precluded from the most important processes for programmatic or personnel change on the campus. And by the t ne they qualify within the present terms, they have often become vassals of departmental disciplinary systems for promotion, either incapable or fearful of performing the important acts for revision or reform. Those members of our faculties closest in age and in temperament and understanding to those to be taught, are most effectively cut off from decision-making power within the academic community.

B. The breakdown of the processes for curricular change and revision in the university can only be understood in terms of what must be decided and who has the power to decide.

What must be decided is dominated by a version of education which assumes in a way designed to create despair, a surplus of knowledge and a shortage of time. Six-thousand years of recorded human history must somehow be packaged within boxes of the prevailing credit hour system, the present nine or ten month conception of the academic year, the existing notions of what appropriate teaching loads are, and what the right balance between teaching and research is.

Curriculum development has always been and always will be a sophisticated art of selection. But under the existing circumstances ---given prevailing academic prejudices about the people who want to learn, how people learn, about what should be excluded and how decisions should be made in academe---the art is almost impossible to practice. The key issues now are: Within what frameworks of value should the selections be made; and who should participate in the power to interpret and select? These issues are put in perfect focus by the current efforts of essentially senior, white faculties, operating through conventional academic channels, to devise Black study programs, while maintaining that the distortions in existing curricula are not the result of their own scholarly abuses of academic freedom.

Of course professional qualification and experience are critical in the practice of the art. But unfortunately, professional self-interest---the maintenance of professional status and power---have gotten involved; and the interests of the consumers, who often represent uniquely different fields of experience and qualification, excluded. Theyounger adults---faculty and students---who are the main sources of the unrest, are excluded. The exclusion of those who are the most potential generators of unrest is a powerful and sure way to insure

the intensification of the causes of unrest. The failure to provide for the effective expression of their views will naturally lead them to challenge more intensely the expression of self-interest by those now empowered to decide.

C. The maturation of professional self-interest in American higher education, and the pursuit of it by those in charge, leads to serious distortions of reason and justice in academic law and order, and of the capacity of academic managers to reach wise and just decisions. Indeed, the academic managers, almost willingly, have become a part of the process of distortion. They are the monopolists of the vital data upon which so much of the administration of campus justice depends, and the partners of the governing boards of the academic corporations---who, either because of ignorance, remoteness, or intention, sustain and promote the distortion.

Nothing illustrates the distortion more incisively than the national tendencies in higher education regarding the relationships among faculty salaries, teaching loads, class sizes, who teaches what, and the deployment of the physical resources throughout our colleges and universities.

Generally, what has happened and continues to happen is:
---faculty salaries are going up, and
---teaching loads are going down,
---at rates faster than the expansion of overall institutional budgets (or, on a national scale, than the rate of increase of the proportion of the national treasure devoted to higher education.)

This imbalance in growth rates means that as salaries increase, and contact teaching hours decrease (from 15 per week to 12 and 9 in the two-year colleges and to 9 and 6 or less in the senior colleges, graduate and professional schools), class sizes have necessarily increased. As junior faculty are usually assigned the least desirable teaching loads, and as the lower years of both undergraduate and graduate teaching are considered, according to prevailing prejudices, the least desirable, the largest class sizes are usually scheduled for those levels, and are assigned to the least experienced teachers. These are, of course, the critical ports-of-entry for the new student clientele---for the large number of minority group youth and others getting into the system for the first time, most from faltering secondary systems which ill-prepare them for the initial collegiate academic discipline. Those getting in at a point where their needs

are the greatest, receive in many ways, the least from the institutions admitting them.

The reduced teaching loads are developing into a national pattern of three or even two-day work weeks on the campuses, and in the urban areas beset by major transportation problems, the three-day weeks are increasingly scheduled, especially for senior faculty, between the hours of ten in the mornings and three or four in the afternoons.

Of course this pattern seriously distorts the deployment of physical facilities, creating peak periods of congestion in the assignment of classroom and laboratory facilities, and other periods of underutilization. If this situation was corrected, and if evening hours, Saturdays, and summer periods were brought into full utilization, our nation would probably confront an immediate oversupply of higher educational physical facilities, notwithstanding the horrendous and expensive waste built into much of the present academic plant.

But an even more serious consequence of this situation is its subversion of remaining opportunities to develop a sense of community among those who teach and those who are taught. The system puts all personnel in fast motion and at greater and greater distances from each other. Within the framework of complex and harried schedules and larger and larger classrooms, the people on the contemporary campus pass each other like ships on a foggy day---tentatively, remotely, suspiciously, and with horns blowing louder and louder. The credit-course system for packaging the knowledge emerges as the one sure, computerized beacon breaking through the fog. It tells everyone exactly where to go---unless---unless the destinations sought are the ones which bear most upon the popular sense of justice, like the desire for self-government, self-control, and self-identity or common political causes.

This pattern of pursuing self-interest finds a part of its justification in the performance of the other functions of the mature academic professional. But there is some evidence that something less than fifteen percent of the full-time teaching cadre ever publishes anything, good or bad; and there is virtually no evidence bearing upon the quality of the bulk of the academic research produced---whether it is qualitatively better or worse than the bulk of the so-called research produced through the Ph.D. thesis machinery.

To these aspects of campus order, academic law, and due process, must

be added the more conventional complaints about the conditions which govern student life, the invasion of and disrespect for their private affairs, and the artificial rigging of their campus civitas. Finally, the disconnections between the entirety of the campus and the corporate and legal fictions ultimately responsible for it in the eyes of the state, complete the picture. It is a picture which naturally encourages some students to occupy buildings as a base of power for a do-business conversation with presidents, deans, and trustees they have never met. It is a picture which encourages the majority either to drop out of school in fact, or to drop out of everything going on there except the credit-course game. It is a picture which leads the young to misunderstand what the older mean when they lecture about law and order, and due process. It is a picture which casts an hypnotic and paralyzing spell upon all who look at it at a moment of truth, great pressure, crisis. At such moments, faculties, student bodies, and administrators are either appalled, disarmed, and incompetent; or they are stampeded into an admission of the breakdown of their own laws, their own processes, the order for which they have stood. Unhappily, when the injunctions are sought and ordered or when the police are called and arrive, the public power is applied to enforce what appears to many young Americans to be unjust law, tyrannical order, and processes which no American could honestly defend or accept as due.

III. CITIES AND SEGREGATIONS

At this stage of our history more and more young Americans are growing up in cities and suburbs, and are entering colleges in the cities or seeking admission to such colleges during the course of their higher education. The majority will choose to work and live in great metropolitan centers. The majority aspire to life-styles these centers can best accommodate, life-styles which require an urban mentality to implement.

A. Contemporary American youth, white and Black, know more by the age of eighteen as a result of life experience in the technological environment than most of our schools give them credit for. Most of our schools, designed in the image of the monastic superblock enclave, champion a stereotyped version of middle-class American culture and morality inside their walls. But most middle-class white youth have penetrated the realities of the practice of this culture and morality in the places from which they come---at home. And for most Black and Spanish-speaking youth, what is championed is either utterly alien or, for many reasons, unacceptable or irrelevant. (For most Blacks, the college campus is the first community in which they have ever had a sustained exposure to white society. Consequently, in their eyes the distance between preachments and practices will appear in very bold and exaggerated relief.)

B. Seventeen or eighteen is the demarcation line (drawn long ago in an entirely different era) between the lower and the higher educational monopolies. It is the line meant to separate the boys from the almost-men (who can be drafted at nineteen). This line no longer corresponds to experience-quotients of the urban-oriented clientele.

The senior year of our high schools is a wasteland---dominated in the case of the college-bound, by the importance of preparing for the final College Entrance Board Examinations. The first semester is filled with the anxieties of applying for college and taking the final tests; the second semester literally counts for nothing---given the way the system has encouraged counting things.

The freshman college year is devastated by the compromises resulting from the senior system's view of prestige and status and by the increasing remedial content of what is offered.

What we have here is a debilitated two-year span arching over a contrived and unrealistic threshold. We have done almost everything we can to insure the upset of those involved.

C. The traditional wall separating the campus from the community is inevitably a barricade in the modern urban setting. Most urban students commute from the realities of where they live to the other "community" where they are supposed to learn. The meaning of the ghetto, the war, the urban economic turmoil and all the rest cannot automatically be turned off and on twice a day when the line between the campus and world is crossed. The continued attempt to compel students to turn off reality this way succeeds only in turning the students off.

D. The university in the city cannot possibly sustain its pretensions as a monopolist of the best teaching and learning talents and resources. In the arts, in industry, in government and in a variety of technical institutions, are configurations of talent and resource superior to what any urban university can mobilize on a full-time basis---by the ranks, with tenure.

The university's insistence upon its traditional way of doing business, and its deep prejudice against the learning arenas where powerful people in our society actually make decisions, are serious and dangerous barriers to the provision of the best learning opportunities our urban society can now provide for its youth. Insofar as the young and the lay public increasingly understand this, present academic prejudice and practice will magnify discontent and resistance.

The urban context for higher education is a distinct and novel development on the American landscape. The collision of this context with the nineteenth century mentality guiding the way we have built and bureaucratized our educational institutions, creates a deeply disruptive situation. This disruption centers on the challenge to the traditional segregations, of people, places, and ideas at the heart of the older versions of how higher education should be.

Our campuses have been planned to segregate the younger from the older adults, the technologies from the liberal arts, the academic from the other relevant learning talents and resources, the Black from the white, and the learning community itself from the city environment upon which it depends.

IV. PLANNED UNEQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

The criteria used to keep some people out of higher education (the so-called "admissions" standards) have had the cumulative effect of projecting class (and thus race) differences into higher education.

In order to accommodate the new classes forcing their way in, institutions and campuses have been differentiated in terms of stereotyped versions of who can be taught what, when, and how. An elitist view of class and race has been built into quality distinctions between two-and four-year campuses and through the physical-geographic segregation of students within single campuses.

In the defense of prevailing notions of "quality," different curricula have been advanced to project stereotyped academic versions of the learning capacities of different classes and races. Consequently, the technologies are increasingly segregated from the traditional liberal arts, the sciences from the rest, the two-year degree clientele from the four, the aspirants for professional accreditation from those tracked in so-called para-professional pursuits, the research-oriented from the teaching experts, the experts in the "remediation" field from the mainstream, etc. Heterogeneity is honored less and less in higher education, notwithstanding the clear warnings advanced in such studies as Coleman's about the anti-educational impact of social, cultural, and intellectual homogeneity in the learning community.

These developments reflect a serious confusion about what <u>equality</u> of higher educational opportunity means. A growing equalization of the opportunity to get into higher education is confused with the more or less static and tracked range of options open to people once they get in and the quality of the options available, especially to the new classes getting in. This tracking (academic segregation) is the seed-bed of future unrest not only on the campuses, but in the nation.

Everywhere in our great cities minority group youth is recoiling from the less-than bachelor's degree, from technology-oriented, from dead-ended degree programs planned for them in the junior colleges. When Secretary Finch or Commissioner Allen speak of the two-year college as the great equalization opportunity for Black and Spanish-speaking youth, they misread the minds of that youth and estimate incorrectly the potential of the two-year colleges in the cities. They make some conventional assumptions that are now false.

It is false to assume that Poverty is exclusively an economic concept. It is false to assume that the new clientele, whose ancestors manned the lower rungs of the American agricultural or industrial economy, will now settle for access only to the lower rungs of the technology economy. It is false to assume that the two-year colleges are preparing people for jobs that will exist ten years from now, or that the trade unions are sufficiently cooperative regarding access to some jobs for which these colleges effect an immediate preparation. It is false to assume that two years is enough, given the character of most urban secondary school systems. And finally, it is false to assume confronted with a clientele deeply disturbed about self-identity, the meaning of being American, and, necessarily, the mastery of American decision-making processes, that preparation for jobs is tantamount to education. Liberal education, assumed to be a necessity for middle-class youth, is an imperative survival requirement (updated and modernized) for minority group youth. On my own campus there is growing evidence that the newly admitted Black and Puerto Rican youth are performing from low C through F in the introductory math, science, and grammar courses, and from middle C through high B in significant parts of the social science and humanities curricula. This says something important about the previous education to which these humans have been exposed, and about their sophistication regarding actual life experience and current concern.

A recent study of the American Association for the Advancement of Science shows that in the typical technology-oriented junior college degree program in the U.S. ---encompassing sixty to seventy credit hours over two years--- the average liberal arts component beyond the sciences is between nine and twelve hours---barely enough for introductory exposure to the rudiments of American history, American literature, and the A, B, C's of economics, psychology or political science. Sociology and philosophy are almost lost in this shuffle. In any event, such curricula are hardly the staging grounds for future Americans willing, ready, and able to play the American game the way the majority wants it played. The truth is that the bulk of the so-called liberal arts input in these programs is now dominated by remedial English, math and science subject-matter.

A clear distinction must be made between the two-year college located in the agricultural or small-town American setting, and the provision of higher educational opportunity for our young people in the great cities. Something new must be invented to meet the challenge of the urban situation.

V. RECONSTRUCTIONS

Planning for qualitative disruption---the essence of higher education---requires major policy shifts on the part of government and the academic community.

A. Grants and loans to students in behalf of advanced education should be made directly to individuals in a manner which insures their independence from both family and institution and encourages competitive selection of institutions for the purposes of education.

B. Federal legislation for the assistance of the public lower schools and colleges and universities, should in significant part be framed to compel a new collaboration between the two in the development of programs and the construction of campuses, especially involving the secondary and collegiate systems in urban centers.

C. A much more direct tie should be made legislatively between funds for Model Cities programs, and funds for urban higher education.

D. Most academic residential construction, especially for students, persists in honoring discredited life-styles and ends up resembling the worst of low-income project housing. Governmental loan and grant programs in support of such construction should begin to assert humane living standards involving the input of national panels of our best architects, urban planners, sociologist, etc.

E. Federal legislation for the expansion of the Two-Year College Movement should carefully allow for experimental and innovative new collegiate starts in the cities, distinguishing the viability of the two-year college in the non-urban setting from its obvious limitations in the urban situation.

F. Programs, allowing for the input of top talent in industry, government, technical and artistic institutions, should be developed and encouraged projecting the intern and apprentice educational concepts throughout the urban environment.

G. Federal legislation should be encouraged anticipating the growing

unionization of professional groups serving higher education---especially of those who teach---to require the representation of consumer classes in all negotiations between employees and management. In higher education, the consumer classes which must be represented in such negotiations are the students, alumni, and elements of the lay-public beyond governing board representatives who are cast in these situations (by law) in the role of management.

H. National educational organizations (like A.C.E.) should aggressively promote nation-wide conversation in the profession aimed at the reconsideration of the relationships between salary trends and workloads, and the content and staging of educational programs, especially at undergraduate levels.

Beyond these items, there are other subjects which should enjoy priority treatment in a national dialogue about the future of our colleges and universities in an age of universal higher education. These include:

--- the role of students in the government of their own learning communities;
--- the use of student talent in tutorial education;
--- the opening up of city-wide curricula for students based upon the collaborative offerings of several educational institutions in the city;
--- the intensive consideration of programs, both architectural and educational for the intelligent and systematic demolition of the deteriorating academic walls between thought and action, the academic place and the city itself as a campus.